Challenge From A New "Castro", P. 2

AEC Chairman Seaborg Sees No Need Now for Resuming U.S. Atmospheric Testing, See Page 3

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. IX, NO. 41 NOVEMBER 6, 1961 WASHINGTON, D. C. 15 CENTS

Stalin's A Hard Man to Keep in The Grave

They may remove Stalin's body from the tomb, but they have not yet removed his spirit from the Party. To read through the voluminous transcripts of the speeches at the 22d Congress, as broadcast by the Soviet radio, is to see how much remains unchanged: the low and vulgar level of discourse to which party gatherings fell in Stalin's time, the obsequious quack-quack with which the delegates jump up to repeat the same stereotyped phrases, the suffocatingly Byzantine adulation heaped on Khrushchev as it was once heaped on Stalin. The former, too, has become a universal genius, beneficently fructifying literature, military science, agriculture and Marxism-Leninism with his wide-ranging insight, as may be seen from the selected paeans in the adjoining box. The Party's Orwellian capacity for doing exactly what it disavows is seen again in the way a new cult of personality is built up around Khrushchev in the very act of fulminating against the cult of personality! Caesar thrice rejecting the crown was not more invitingly modest than Khrushchev when he told the Congress on the 27th:

> **While coming out resolutely against all the abominable phenomena of the cult of the individual, Marxist-Leninists have always recognized and will recognize the authority of leaders. But it would be wrong to single out this or that leader, to set him apart in any way from the ruling collective, to extol him inordinately. This is contrary to the principles of Marxism-Leninism. You all know how strongly Marx, Engels and Lenin came out against those who lauded their merits. Yet the great role of the founders of scientific communism, Marx, Engels and Lenin, and their great services to the working class, to all mankind, simply cannot be overstated. (Prolonged applause).**

Still Using Stalin's Vocabulary

Stalin's body is to be removed from the Lenin tomb. The purger is to be purged. But Mme. Furtseva at the very same Congress (see box on the back page) announces as Minister of Culture that the arts must still toe the line of "socialist realism," which was Stalin's formula. Shelepin, head of the secret police, is promoted to the nine-man Party Secretariat, the highest ruling body in the Soviet Union—the first time the secret police has appeared that high in the party hierarchy since Beria was shot in 1953. Shelepin's speech on the 26th refers to the "anti-party group" as "political corpses," a coarse and minatory phrase right out of Stalin's vocabulary. Kozlov, Khrushchev's No. 2 man, in presenting amendments to the governing statutes of the Party on the 28th, declares himself against "any attempts to suppress criticism" but adds warningly, "Naturally one must not allow a situation to come about in which the party can be drawn into a sterile discussion at the whim of some small group of muddle-headed or immature people" which might lead to "the subversion of party unity." This will hardly encourage free discussion.

Khrushchev promised more democracy within the party but the fight against the "anti-party group" is carried on as in Stalin's time by smears and threats. If the opposition is as bankrupt and impotent as Khrushchev claims, why so much fuss about it? If inner party democracy is to be encouraged as a guarantee against the excesses of the Stalin period, why not demonstrate this by allowing the opposition to speak for itself and defeating it in open debate? Why, instead, are the oppositionists asked to humiliate themselves by public confession of error, as the price of safety, exactly as in Stalin's time? Why the hints of trials for their crimes under Stalin, when every one of the leaders, including Khrushchev and Mikoyan, were able to survive only by being the willing accomplices of Stalin's hatchet men?

(Continued on Page Four)

Another Universal Genius (Like S——)

"The speeches of Nikita Sergeyevich Khrushchev on the problems of art and literature are giving invaluable aid to the artistic intelligentsia in their creative work. . . . Nikita Sergeyevich Khrushchev set for writers, artists, composers, workers of the screen and theatre, supremely important problems of creative work. He profoundly revealed. . . ."

—Minister of Culture Furtseva to the 22d Congress.

"The concrete basic tasks of the armed forces . . . have been concisely and expressively set out in his historic report . . . by our supreme commander-in-chief, Nikita Sergeyevich Khrushchev. (Stormy Applause). The report also made a profound analysis of the character of modern war. . . ."

—Defense Minister Malinovsky, 22d Congress.

"The planting of corn in 1961, in comparison with 1953, increased almost 7.5 times. We all know that in this is the great service of Nikita Sergeyevich Khrushchev. He revealed to the country the valiant strength of corn, made us love it. . . ."

—Deputy Chairman, USSR Council of Ministers Ignatov.

"The activities of Comrade Khrushchev—his inexhaustible seething energy, his truly revolutionary Leninist approach to the solution of complicated questions of theory and practice. . . ."

—Ukrainian CP Secretary Podgorny, 22d Congress.

"It is truly difficult to estimate, to overvaluate the historic importance of the courage of the CPSU Central Committee, headed by N. S. Khrushchev, in eliminating the harmful consequences of the personality cult."

—Lithuanian CP Secretary Snechkus, 22d Congress.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

He Asks Whether Our Concern Is Really With Democracy or Only With Capitalism

British Guiana's Dr. Jagan Tells Washington Why He Is A Socialist

We present here in abridged form the speech made to the National Press Club in Washington Oct. 24 by Dr. Cheddi Jagan, Premier of British Guiana. Its courage, its eloquence, and the insight it provides into problems and attitudes typical of the whole emerging colonial world, merit wider audience. Dr. Jagan, after Castro, is the second warning bell for American policy in Latin America. Will we heed its message in time?

I am told that I am a controversial figure. I am, I believe, generally dismissed in this country as a Communist. Let me now tell you where I stand.

First of all, I am a passionate anti-colonialist. I, like your forefathers, believe that colonialism is wicked. I believe so strongly that colonialism is utterly wrong that I would gladly accept any help from whatever quarter to help me in my fight against it.

My country is about the size of Great Britain or Minnesota. It is a poor country but it has considerable unused resources and great possibilities for development. At the moment, however, most of its half million people barely eke out a living on a narrow low-lying coastal strip of land which accounts for only four percent of our land area. Although the country is mainly agricultural we still have to import many agricultural products. This is not the only paradox in our situation. In a country so largely unoccupied, there is also grave land hunger, for it takes sums of money to reclaim and then protect cultivable land from floods, the sea and the jungle.

A Typical Colonial Economy

There is almost no industry. My country depends on three or four main products—sugar, bauxite, rice and timber—the exploitation of two of which are in the hands of foreign companies. These two, sugar and bauxite, account for 75 percent of the exports of the country. British Guiana today presents the typical pattern of a colonial economy.

I am dedicated to the task of changing this pattern. I wish to see my country prosperous and developing. Second only to my passion for the independence of my people is this dedication to their economic advancement. Now, in this I am a socialist. By this I mean that I am in favor of the workers reaping the full fruits of their labor through public ownership of the means of production, distribution and exchange. I believe that it is only by planning on this basis and with a scientific assessment of our situation that I can rapidly modernize our economy.

I believe ideally in the nationalization of all the important means of production, distribution and exchange. This will ensure a fairer distribution of a country's wealth than any other system. But I also have to recognize things as they are. While I reserve our right, as any sovereign nation does, to nationalize whatever industry we think should be nationalized in the public interest we have explicitly stated that we have no intention of nationalizing the existing sugar and bauxite companies. These companies today dominate our economy, but British Guiana is still largely underdeveloped. We are resolved to diversify our economy and to industrialize it rapidly so that as we launch new enterprises the proportion of our national income produced by expatriate enterprise becomes smaller and their present command of our economic life weakened. If on the other hand it ever became necessary to nationalize any industries, fair and adequate compensation would be paid.

Part of the New Socialist Tide

I place myself in company with other nationalist leaders of Asia and Africa. I believe like these nationalist leaders that the economic theories of scientific socialism hold out the promise of a dynamic and social discipline which can transform an under-developed country into a developed one in a far shorter time than any other system.

We may differ from you on the way we organize our economic life. You have as your dominant philisophy private enterprise but let us not forget that your development took place in a different historical epoch when conditions—economic and technological—were not as they are today. But we certainly do not differ from you in our political objectives which is the establishment of a democratic way of life.

I have won my place in the political life of my country in three successive general elections. I believe in parliamentary democracy, by which I recognize the rights of opposition parties, freedom of speech, freedom of worship, regular and honest elections, an impartial judiciary and an independent civil service. I have struggled for these freedoms and it was I who first proposed that a Bill of Rights guaranteeing every citizen his fundamental rights, including the right to hold property, buttressed by an appeal to the courts, be entrenched in the new constitution of British Guiana.

Finally may I touch briefly on the place we hope to take in the world when our independence is achieved shortly. I mean to pursue a policy of active neutralism. Because of the immensity of our problems I am forced like India and some other underdeveloped countries to seek aid from all possible sources. I have however made no secret of the fact that I will not accept aid upon conditions which limit the sovereignty of my people. We do not intend to be a bridgehead or a base for anyone. I am concerned only with the urgent problems of the social and economic development of my country. I am not interested in the cold war in which in any case my country can play no effective role.

Faith in the United Nations

We look forward in due course to taking our place in the United Nations which represents, particularly for small nations, their guarantee of independence and their hope for the future. I feel that my country can in our contemporary world of blocs and groups play a part in bringing about a better understanding among nations. In a sense we should not be unqualified to do so. We are a small people mainly of Afro-Asian descent. We are situated in Latin America but we speak the English language and have strong ties with North America and the British Commonwealth.

In a sense our visit to this country, our request to you for aid, is a test of basic principles. The Government of the United States has stated clearly that their concern is to foster and preserve democracy, that the internal affairs of democratic countries are their own concern. What then happens when a people by an admittedly genuine popular vote are for a socialist economic system? Will the United States respect this decision? Or will she withhold her aid at the very real risk of that democracy being overthrown by a dictatorial uprising based on the people's poverty? Will the United States Government give in to pressure groups and so act as to preserve capitalism by sacrificing democracy?

There are not lacking, even within this country itself, writers, thinkers, scholars, who hold that when the Government of the United States uses the word "democracy" they really mean capitalism. If these men are right, then we can expect no help, for while we are an admittedly genuine democracy we are also admittedly socialist.

Sooner or later this issue had to be squarely faced and clarified by your administration. History has chosen my own small country to be the focus of this problem. The decision must now be made.

Indeed, gentlemen, it is not our concept of democracy which is now on trial, but yours.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Off the Capital Ticker Tape: Paradox in Indochina, New Criticism of the AMA

JFK's Shelter Plea to Homeowners Off – A Threat from West Germany

Best news of the week if true (and my own check leads me to believe it is): the report in the *Washington Post* (Oct. 30) that President Kennedy has finally turned thumbs down on a plan to send a letter to every homeowner in the country this month asking him to build a bomb shelter. . . . Most disturbing news (next to the Soviet note to Finland): Byrnum Shaw's dispatch from Bonn in the *Baltimore Sun* (Oct. 28) quoting "qualified informants" in the Adenauer government as saying that West Germany may abandon its postwar pledge not to manufacture atomic, bacteriological or chemical weapons if a Soviet-American agreement should deprive it of "modern weapons." . . .

Grateful salute: to Federal Judge Sidney Silverman for acquitting (albeit only on a technical error in the government's pleadings) Martin Yarus and Elliott Sullivan charged with contempt of the House Un-American Activities Committee. . . . The Supreme Court's latest decision in a witch hunt contempt case (Hugh de Gregory v. Attorney General of New Hampshire) shows the Court is still 5-to-4 in favor of the inquisitors. In this, the third case to come up from New Hampshire (Sweezy and Uphaus were the others), the Court without opinion upheld a conviction for contempt of that State's one-man un-American Activities Committee. Warren, Black, Douglas and Brennan dissented. . . . This does not bode well for five contempt convictions up for review at this term of court, those of Norton A. Russell, Robert Shelton, Alden Whitman, Herman Liveright and Wm. A. Price.

Both London's Sunday Times and The Observer (Oct. 29) carry stories on a steady flight of men and money from West Berlin. . . . Fraternal cheers: to Hank Greenspun, editor and publisher of the Las Vegas (Nev.) Sun on his full pardon from President Kennedy for Neutrality Act violations in smuggling arms via Mexico to the Haganah in Israel's 1948 birth struggle. . . . The day after Cambodia's Ambassador, Nong Kimny, held a press conference to deny charges that his country had attacked South Vietnam, Keyes Beech of the Chicago Daily News (Oct. 31) filed a dispatch from the "invasion" site, calling it a phony thought up by an "agile American public relations man who gets paid an undisclosed sum of money to make President Ngo Dinh Diem's government look better than it possibly is. . . ." Tantalizing mystery: why is the only democratic government in what was Indochina, the only one which does not have a pro-Communist guerrilla problem, the only one which defeated the Communists at home politically without suppression, that is Cambodia, treated as a kind of suspect stepchild by our government and press, while the Thai and South Vietnam dictatorships are our honored wards, allies and pets? . . . Prince Sihanouk, Cambodia's chief of state, is one of the most enlightened statesmen in the world today but the CIA twice tried to get rid of him by fomenting unsuccessful rightist uprisings. . . .

The American Medical Association is trying to cover its scandalous alliance with the drug industry by a press agent gimmick: a highly advertised campaign against "quacks," little quacks, that is, but the truth is catching up with it. The influential New England Journal of Medicine in a series of recent editorials attacks the AMA's board of trustees for opposition to Kefauver's proposed drug reforms.

Peccavi (and Penitence) Dept.

Dear Mr. Stone:

What page of I. F. Stone's Weekly, do you read? "Where the President said, 'We must never fear to negotiate,' it says 'we must never fear to refuse to negotiate'."

—Stone discussing Air Force Association statement, Weekly of Oct. 16.

"The President has said, 'We must never negotiate through fear, but we must never fear to negotiate.' In turn, we must never fear to refuse to negotiate that which is not negotiable." [Emphasis now added]

—Actual AFA text, p. 2, Weekly of Oct. 16.

Sincerely yours,
Allen H. Barton
Assoc. Professor of Sociology, Columbia Univ.

AEC Chairman Takes Unhysterical View of Whether We Need to Test in the Air

Mr. SPIVACK (Meet the Press): At one time you said we can go a long way toward keeping pace with the Russians even if they continue testing in the atmosphere, if we continue testing underground, is that correct?

Chairman SEABORG (Atomic Energy Commission): Yes.

Mr. SPIVACK: Do you still believe that?

Chairman SEABORG: Yes, I still believe that.

Mr. SPIVACK: Then you really don't think it is necessary for us to test in the atmosphere in order to keep up with the Russians, despite their present tests?

Chairman SEABORG: No, I said we could go a long way toward keeping up with the Russians. If you raise the question whether we could keep up indefinitely, forever, with the Russians testing in the atmosphere and our testing underground, I wouldn't be so sure.

Mr. SPIVACK: What about these 25 or 26 tests that they have made so far, can we test in the underground and still keep up with them despite these tests?

Chairman SEABORG: Yes, I believe so.

Mr. SPIVACK: You were reported as saying that you didn't think the Russians were ahead of us in nuclear development. Do you still feel that way, despite these 25 tests?

Chairman SEABORG: Yes, I still feel that way. . . .

Mr. FINNEY (New York Times): What do you believe are the objectives of this [Soviet] test series?

Chairman SEABORG: . . . to improve their weapons arsenal but in addition they apparently have non-technical objectives that I have referred to earlier, the psychological and the political and the terroristic objectives.

Mr. FINNEY: On the terroristic point, are you suggesting on the 50 megaton bomb that it is not really necessary to detonate such a device to develop it?

Chairman SEABORG: That is right. It is not necessary to detonate a full yield of 50 megatons in order to develop it. Tests at smaller yields, yields more in the range of their earlier tests, would be sufficient to develop a bomb of that magnitude, or of higher magnitude. . . .

Mr. FINNEY: If the Soviet Union develops a 50 or 100 megaton bomb, do you feel it would be incumbent upon the U.S. to develop similar weapons to have a counter deterrent?

Chairman SEABORG: No, I don't. . . .

Mr. SPIVACK: Have our detecting devices been improved in the three years of the moratorium?

Chairman SEABORG: Yes, I would say they have. . . .

Mr. SPIVACK: Dr. Seaborg, the moratorium with the Russians was on testing but not on production. Have we been able to improve our weapons during the period of the moratorium?

Chairman SEABORG: . . . we certainly have been improving our weapons during the moratorium, very substantially.

—Meet the Press, Oct. 29.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Kirov Assassination — Staged to Frighten Stalin Into Terrorism

(Continued from Page One)

Afraid to Look Him In the Eye

There is no doubt that Khrushchev hated Stalin, with a hatred born of a lifetime's fear. A passage in his speech of the 27th vividly recreates the terrorized atmosphere of the inner circle in Stalin's time. "Stalin could look at a comrade sitting at the same table with him," Khrushchev told the Congress, "and say: 'Your eyes are shifting today.' Afterward it could be taken for granted that the comrade whose eyes were supposedly shifting was under suspicion." And suspicion could mean a fall overnight from power and all its privileges to a stinking labor camp in the Arctic, or worse. But Khrushchev's hatred for Stalin does not impel him to reforms fundamental enough to prevent a repetition of the gross inhumanity which marked the Stalin period. The 22d Congress illustrates how weak and inadequate was the putting forward of "personality cult" as an explanation for what went wrong under Stalin. So great was popular bitterness when he died that his successors had to throw open the prison camps and kill the secret police chief Beria as their scapegoat. But slowly in every sphere the Khrushchev party bureaucracy has been taking back the greater freedom of the post-Stalin "thaw."

Bureaucracies everywhere prefer suppression and coercion to persuasion and criticism. The biggest opposition to de-stalinization has come from bureaucratic inertia. Khrushchev on the 27th tried to cow the "anti-party" group by threatening to reopen the Kirov affair, the assassination of a popular and "liberal" Leningrad leader in December 1934 which inaugurated the Stalin terror. This seems to have been the handiwork of conspirators in the Stalin secret police apparatus. The real lesson is that they hoped thereby to frighten the dictator away from liberal reforms. This part of the story Khrushchev did not tell. Only a few months earlier Stalin had abolished the GPU, and limited the powers of the new political police which replaced it. The Kirov assassination seems to have been designed to make Stalin fear that he faced a murderous opposition which could be met only by again strengthening the secret police.

What happened before can happen again. The day is coming, if peace can be preserved, when a new generation in Russia will get rid not just of Stalin's mummy but of his system. The day will come when they will borrow from our own Bill of Rights to establish, under socialism, those freedoms of speech and of security against arbitrary police action which can alone eradicate Stalinism. Marx, to whom a statue has just been erected in Moscow, never dreamt that socialism would bring into being a system under which momentous decisions of war and peace, like the Russian resumption of testing, could be taken not only without popular discussion but without even letting the people know. To a new Russian revolutionary youth these lines are dedicated.

The More It Changes . . .

"One is called on to wage a resolute struggle for high ideological-artistic level of art works, to be merciless toward any deviations from the principles of socialist realism. The most important task of art experts and critics is an uncompromising struggle against hostile ideological views, exposing the reactionary art of the bourgeoisie, giving a crushing rebuff to revisionists of all types and shades . . . resolutely combatting pseudo-innovation and formalism and all distortions in art . . . abstract painting and formless music. . . . Reactionary critics of Soviet literature and art accuse our writers and artists of tying their work to the policy of the party, thus allegedly restricting artistic freedom. To this there can be only one answer: We understand creative freedom differently."

—Minister of Culture Furtseva to the 22d Congress.

"Stalin is said to have formulated, in conversations with writers, his doctrine of the kind of truth which a Communist writer should seek to portray, to which he gave the name Socialist realism. . . . He [the writer] must portray reality as seen by the party. . . . He must also inculcate in the masses those ideas which the party desires to inculcate. . . . The purges of 1936-38 during which a number of prominent writers of the early period of Soviet literature disappeared, served as a warning that from creative literary freedom to charges of counter-revolution was only a short step."

—Leonard Schapiro: The Communist Party of the Soviet Union, p. 465.

Hear IFS on a Civil Defense Panel, All Souls Church, 16th & Harvard, Washington, 8 P.M., Fri., Nov. 10

I. F. Stone's Weekly, 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W. Washington 15, D. C.

Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed $5:*

Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

11/6/61

Enter gift sub for $2 (6 mos.) or $4 (1 yr.) additional:

(To) Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

Shall we send gift announcement? Yes ☐ No ☐

I. F. Stone's Weekly
5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.
Washington 15, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

Second class postage paid at Washington, D. C.

I. F. Stone's Weekly. Second Class Postage Paid at Washington, D. C. Published every Monday except the last Monday in August and the first in September and the last Monday in December and the first in January at 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W., Washington, D. C. An independent weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager, Esther M. Stone. Subscription: $5 in the U. S.; $6 in Canada; $10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: $15 to Europe; $20 to Israel, Asia and Africa.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED